

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is requiring an election of a single species:

Species I: Linear olefin having at least 6 carbon atoms;

Species II: An epoxidation product of a dimer of a linear olefin; and

Species III: Oligomer of a linear olefin compound having 6 to 30 carbon atoms.

Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Species III (encompassing at least Claims 1, 5, and 7) for examination.

Applicants make no statement regarding the patentable distinctness of the species, but note that for restriction to be proper, there must be a patentable difference between the species as claimed. MPEP § 808.01(a). The Office has not provided any reasons or examples to support a conclusion that the species are indeed patentably distinct. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction is improper, and Applicants' election of species is for examination purposes only.

Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner of MPEP § 803.02, which states in part:

On the other hand, should the examiner determine that the elected species is allowable, the examination of the Markush-type claim will be extended.”

Accordingly, Applicants request that the search be expanded to include all species upon finding the provisionally elected species allowable.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has not shown that an examination of all of the identified species can be made without serious burden placed on the Examiner. Applicants further submit that the Examiner has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the requirement for election. Therefore, Applicants request that the requirement for election be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor
Registration No. 36,379